

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/992,735	11/13/2001	James Bradford Copelan		8937	
7	7590 . 06/18/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
Linda Flewellen Gould			BECKER,	BECKER, DREW E	
Gould & Whiti Suite 101	ley		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	1665 Briargate Boulevard			1761	
Colorado Sprir	ngs, CO 80920		DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004	DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/992,735	COPELAN, JAMES	S BRADFORD			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	-			
	Drew E Becker	1761				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY			dress			
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Oc	ctober 2003.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
.—	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	63 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) 6,8 and 17-36 is/are pending in the ap	oplication.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	•					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		<u> </u>				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6,8 and 17-36</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	г.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PT	O-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
,						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTC)-152)			

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of group II in the reply filed on October 23, 2003 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over d'Arbelles [Pat. No. 6,286,682].

d'Arbelles teaches a method comprising the steps of obtaining a alerting label with adhesive or a temporary alerting tattoo, and placing the alerting symbol on the user's body (column 3, lines 10-23; column 4, line 40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the alerting symbol on the user's hand since d'Arbelles

Art Unit: 1761

already teaches placing the symbol anywhere on the body which is appropriate (column 4, line 40) and since the hand is a readily visible area. The recitation "for assisting a person in adhering to a healthy diet" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

5. Claims 17-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over d'Arbelles as applied above, in view of DE 4332471A1.

d'Arbelles teaches the above mentioned concepts. D'Arbelles does not recite placing a label on a food container. DE 4332471A1 teaches a method of informing a user by placing labels on a food container wherein the labels convey advantages and risks of the particular food (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the food container labels of DE 4332471A1 into the invention of d'Arbelles since both are directed to methods of conveying information with labels, since d'Arbelles already included using the labels to convey information such as a diabetic condition (column 3, line 52), since medical conditions such as diabetes required a specific type of diet, and since the labels of DE 4332437A1 would have provided a simple and convenient means of informing the user to the risks and benefits of a particular food item.

Art Unit: 1761

6. Claims 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over d'Arbelles, in view of DE 4332437A1, as applied above, and further in view of Childress [Pat. No. 6,119,862].

d'Arbelles and DE 4332437A1 teach the above mentioned concepts. D'Arbelles and DE 4332437A1 do not recite a partitioned bowl. Childress teaches a method of eating from a partitioned bowl (Figure 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the partitioned bowl of Childress into the invention of d'Arbelles, in view of DE 4332437A1, since d'Arbelles already included a partitioned kit (Figure 2), since DE 4332437A1 already included food containers, and since the partitioned bowl of Childress would have prevented the foods from mixing while also providing the consumer with a means to pick and choose the appropriate food items.

7. Claims 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over d'Arbelles, in view of DE 4332471A, as applied above, and further in view of Hettinger [Pat. No. 5,388,043].

d'Arbelles and DE 4332437A1 teach the above mentioned concepts. D'Arbelles and DE 4332437A1 do not recite applying a symbol to a chart. Hettinger teaches a method of controlling one's diet by applying symbols to a chart (Figure 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the chart of Hettinger into the invention of d'Arbelles, in view of DE 4332471A1, since d'Arbelles already included labels which conveyed information related to one's health, since DE 4332471A1 already included labels for food containers, and since the chart of Hettinger would have provided a convenient means of tracking one's long term diet.

Art Unit: 1761

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-1396. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur. 8am-5pm and every other Fri. 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Drew E Becker Primary Examiner Art Unit 1761

6-17-04